

say that Western population arrest or decline is attributable to a rise in the death-rate." But I certainly did *not* say that. On the contrary, in Chapter III, page 40, speaking of the population of our country, I used these words: "Of recent years the rate of increase has fortunately been slowed up—by the growing practice of birth-control"; and on page 41 I have indicated that "during the last few decades" the same sort of thing has been occurring in other Western populations, due to the same cause.

2. In another part of his review Mr. Shapiro writes: "Dr. White's claims cannot therefore be granted that birth-control will solve completely such problems as the tragedy of unemployment and slum areas, international political tensions and imperialist wars." What I actually said, however, at the beginning of Chapter V, page 72 of my book, is as follows: "In the present chapter I shall show that birth-control is an essential aid to the practice of eugenics, to the achievement of peace, to the elimination of unemployment, and to the attainment of optimum density of population."

There is a great difference, I submit, between the expressions "will solve completely" and "is an essential aid to."

FRANK W. WHITE, L.R.C.P. and S.E.
60 Beverley Terrace,
Cullercoats.

The reviewer writes: With reference to (1) above: It was clearly indicated in the original review that even the contraceptive hypothesis was inadequate as an explanation of what Dr. White calls a "slowing up of the rate of increase" in recent years. Social habits associated with industrialization of the community and the adoption of an urban culture by the population plays a complicated and incompletely understood role. Dr. White made no reference to these important matters and it can therefore be stated without exaggeration that the problem as he described it was over-simplified. The whole position is adequately discussed in Mr. Glass's new book, *The Struggle for Population*. With reference to (2) above: On page 89 Dr. White writes: "Had the rulers of the various countries taught their people of . . . every rank to practise a reasonable amount of birth-control, there would almost certainly have been neither Great War in 1914 nor widespread unemployment to-day. . . ."

This quotation bears out fully the criticism offered in the review of Dr. White's book.

Eugenics in U.S.A.

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—In the issue of the *EUGENICS REVIEW* for April 1936, Dr. Norman E. Himes states that I gave in *The New York Times* an erroneous impression of the nature of the findings of the American Neurological Association findings on sterilization. The correspondence on the subject which has

appeared in *The New York Times* has evidently misled him.

The editorial comments which I wrote of the Association's report met with the general approval of its investigating committee. One reader (not a member of the Association) properly called attention to an omission of mine on the recommendations of the British Committee. I naturally saw to it that the letter of correction was published, as well as other communications on the subject of eugenics, even though they bore no direct relation to the report.

I am also put down by Dr. Himes as "an opponent of eugenics." I am an opponent not of eugenics but of the nonsense that is uttered in its name by far too many American social reformers. Unfortunately we have no periodical in America comparable with your own excellent *EUGENICS REVIEW* to save these well-meaning fanatics—one of whom Dr. Himes himself castigates on page 85 of your April issue—from the pitfalls into which they are for ever stumbling.

WALDEMAR KAEMPFERT,
The New York Times,
Times Square, New York. *Science Editor.*

Nordics and Jews

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—I write, not as a pure-bred Englishman from East Anglia noted for its men of eminence or genius, but as a "hybrid," for my English blood has been diluted by a strain of Scotch.

Mr. Brewer has the assurance, presumably from inside his own mind, that my letter in your issue of last January was a "thinly veiled attempt to stir up anti-Semitism under the pretence of eugenic policy." I am afraid that both his assurance and his inside knowledge are wrong. The meaning of my letter was, what it expressed quite clearly, that, in view of the conclusion in Professor Ruggles Gates's book as to the general unwisdom of crossings between races of widely distant origin or characters, and citing as an apposite instance the salient example of Jew-British marriages, it seems logical for the *Society* to take steps to warn our school authorities in the general matter of unwise crossings.

But supposing that Mr. Brewer's inside knowledge and excellent subjective bias for humanity and justice had led him to guess in the right direction, I should still have to correct his assertions in one or two secondary respects. *Firstly*, I am certainly not an anti-Semite for I am not, for instance, anti-Arab. I am merely anti-Jew in so far as being anti- the influence exerted by them in the lives of the nations amongst whom they dwell. For during the past sixteen years I have had opportunities of studying their history since they entered the scenes of civilization sufficiently to see that they have always brought their hosts more harm than good. *Secondly*, in an attempt to